arXiv:1210.3795v1 [math.PR] 14 Oct 2012

A CLASS OF MULTI-PARTICLE REINFORCED INTERACTING RANDOM WALK

JUN CHEN

Abstract. In this paper, we consider a class of multi-particle reinforced interacting random walk. In this model, there are some (finite or infinite) particles performing random walk on some (finite or infinite) graph, so that each particle has higher probability to visit neighboring vertices or edges which have been seldom visited by the other particles. Specifically in this paper we investigate two particles' vertex-reinforced interacting random walk on finite complete graph. By a dynamical approach we prove that the two particles' occupation measure asymptotically has small joint support almost surely if the reinforcement is strong.

1. Introduction

"Reinforced random walk" (RRW) is a remarkable example of non-Markovian random walk, which has been extensively studied in the last twenty years, see the survey [16]. A good story to help understand RRW appeared in [17]. Imagine a person getting acquainted with a new city. She walks about the area near the hotel somewhat randomly, but tends to traverse the same blocks over and over as they become familiar. To model this, RRW is defined on the vertices of an undirected graph in such a way that the probability of a transition from one vertex to another depends on the number of previous transitions along the neighboring edges (respectively, vertices). We refer to such models as "edge-reinforced random walk" (ERRW) (respectively, "vertex-reinforced random walk" (VRRW)).

RRWs can be defined on all kinds of graphs, either finite or infinite. It also can be defined by very different reinforcement mechanisms through the weight functions, which could lead to quite different phenomena to occur. A question of interest is the recurrence or transience of RRW. For example, Angel et al. [1] showed that the linearly ERRW on any graph with bounded degrees is recurrent for sufficiently small initial weights. Another phenomenon of interest is localization. For example, Pemantle and Volkov [18] showed that VRRW on $\mathbb{Z}$ has finite range, and then Tarrés [21] showed that VRRW on $\mathbb{Z}$ eventually gets stuck on five points. Phase transitions are also of interest. For instance, Pemantle [14] showed that the ERRW on infinite binary tree can vary from transient to recurrent, depending on the value of an adjustable parameter measuring the strength of the feedback (reinforcement), and Volkov [22] showed that VRRW on $\mathbb{Z}$ with weight function k^α will just visit

---

Date: October 16, 2012.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60K35. Secondary: 37C10.
Key words and phrases. Reinforced random walk, stochastic approximation algorithms, dynamical approach, chain recurrent set.

$2, 5, \infty$ sites after a large time T_0 when $\alpha > 1, = 1$ or < 1 respectively.

So far, almost all the considered RRW models are one particle' self-interacting with positive (attractive) feedback (reinforcement), i.e. the edges (or vertices) already being visited more are more likely to be visited in the future. In analyzing such models, four main methods are commonly used: exchangeability [9] [16], branching process embedding [6] [10] [11] [20], stochastic approximation via martingale methods [7] [19], and dynamical system approach [2] [4]. Here we want to say several more words about the history of the dynamical system approach, which has been used in the first half of this paper. The dynamical system approach is an approach to analyze stochastic approximation process (defined later) by its approximating ODE. This approach has been extensively studied since it was introduced by Ljung [12]. From the 90s, Benaïm and his collaborators have developed this approach, which enables to analyze stochastic approximation process with much more general dynamics.

One direction to generalize RRW is to consider multi-particle RRW. Kovchegov [9] showed for the two particles' edge reinforced process on $\mathbb{Z}$, the two particles meet infinitely often a.s.. In his model, each particle's transition probability is positively reinforced (determined) by both particles' visits on the edges. Except his paper, the generalization of RRW to multi-particle RRW models with more general reinforced interacting mechanism hasn't appeared yet so far. In 2010, Itai Benjamini proposed a class of new multi-particle reinforced interacting random walk, and finally our paper is a result of exploration on this model.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 is devoted to the definition of the model; Section 3 is devoted to state our main result; Section 4 is the proof of main result; Some further open problems are proposed in Section 5.

2. The model

In this section, we define a class of two-particle vertex-reinforced interacting random walk on a connected graph. Denote the two particles by X and Y, and the graph by $G = (V, E)$. At each time unit, both X and Y particle will jump to some vertices on V. Set X, Y's locations at time k on V as random variables X_k, Y_k, and the number of X, Y's visits to vertex v by time n as random variables $N(X, v, n), N(Y, v, n)$. In our model, we assume X, Y visit each vertex initially. Then we have

$$N(X,v,n) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{X_k=v}, \quad N(Y,v,n) = N(Y,v,0) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{Y_k=v}, \quad \forall v \in V.$$

Denote the natural filtration generated by $\{X_k, 0 \le k \le n\}$ and $\{Y_k, 0 \le k \le n\}$ by $\mathcal{F}_n (n \in \mathbb{N})$. Then the stochastic process (X_n, Y_n)'s transition probability is defined

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = v|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{1_{v\sim X_n} \cdot w_{N(Y,v,n)}}{\sum_{p\sim X_n} w_{N(Y,p,n)}} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} = v|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{1_{v\sim Y_n} \cdot w_{N(X,v,n)}}{\sum_{p\sim Y_n} w_{N(X,p,n)}}, \tag{2.2}$$

where "$\sim$" generally represents some vertex relation on G (e.g nearest-neighbor), and $w_k (k \in \mathbb{Z}_+)$ is a fixed sequence of positive numbers, referred to as "weights". Like the classical one-particle RRW, one natural weight sequence to work with is $w_k = k^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$.

On a finite graph G of size N_0, one can set

$$x_v(n) = \frac{N(X, v, n)}{n + N_0}, \quad y_v(n) = \frac{N(Y, v, n)}{n + N_0}, \forall v \in V \tag{2.3}$$

as X and Y's *empirical occupation measure* on V by time n. Then the $2N_0$ dimensional vector $[(x_v(n))_{v\in V}, (y_v(n))_{v\in V}]$ is a random process living in a bounded subset of Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{2N_0}$. If w_k (like $k^{-\alpha}$) is homogenous in k, we can rewrite (2.1) and (2.2) as

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = v|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{1_{v\sim X_n} \cdot \varpi(y_v(n))}{\sum_{p\sim X_n} \varpi(y_p(n))} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} = v|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{1_{v\sim Y_n} \cdot \varpi(x_v(n))}{\sum_{p\sim Y_n} \varpi(x_p(n))}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\varpi(x)$ is a function $\varpi : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$. Hence, X, Y's transition probabilities are defined by their occupation measure.

In this paper, we will work with the above defined model (2.4) and (2.5) on finite complete graph. The vertex relation "$\sim$" is that the graph distance between two vertices is less than or equal to 1 and $\varpi(x) = [\delta 1_{x\leq\delta} + x1_{x>\delta}]^{-\alpha}$ for some small positive δ. For convenience, we label the vertex set V of a finite complete graph of size d by the set $S = \{1, \ldots, d\}$. Then for any $i, j \in S$, (2.4) and (2.5) becomes

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = i|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{\left[\delta 1_{y_i(n)\leq\delta} + y_i(n)1_{y_i(n)>\delta}\right]^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} \left[\delta 1_{y_k(n)\leq\delta} + y_k(n)1_{y_k(n)>\delta}\right]^{-\alpha}} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} = j|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{\left[\delta 1_{x_j(n)\leq\delta} + x_j(n)1_{x_j(n)>\delta}\right]^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} \left[\delta 1_{x_k(n)\leq\delta} + x_k(n)1_{x_k(n)>\delta}\right]^{-\alpha}}, \tag{2.7}$$

Set $x(n) = (x_i(n))_{i\in S}$, $y(n) = (y_i(n))_{i\in S}$ and $z(n) = (x(n), y(n))$. Then in this paper we will prove $z(n)$'s asymptotic behavior. Notice that $z(n)$ is a Markov chain living in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Here we want to mention that when $\min_{i,j\in S}\{x_i(n), y_j(n)\} > \delta$, (2.6) and (2.7) are equivalent to the following formulas:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = j|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{N(Y, j, n)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} N(Y, k, n)^{-\alpha}}, \quad \forall i, j \in S; \tag{2.8}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} = j|\mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{N(X, j, n)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} N(X, k, n)^{-\alpha}}, \quad \forall i, j \in S, \tag{2.9}$$

which can be easily seen as X, Y's *repelling* interacting random walk with nonlinear reinforcement.

Notation 2.1. (1) In this paper, we always write Δ as the $(d-1)-$dimensional closed simplex and denote the interior of Δ by Δ°;

(2) Denote the product of two simplex $(\Delta \times \Delta)$ by D, which is the compact domain in our model. Denote the interior of D by D° ;

(3) We will use x (or y, u, v) to represent vectors in Δ and index the time parameter n or t in the vectors by writing $x(n)$ or $x(t)$. The coordinate $i(\in S)$ of the vectors are indexed like $x_i(n)$ or $x_i(t)$. We write (x, y) (or (u, v)) to represent a $2d$ dimensional vector, i.e. $(x, y) = z = (z_i)_{1\leq i\leq 2d}$ where $z_i = x_i (1 \leq i \leq d)$ and $z_i = y_{i-d}(d + 1 \leq i \leq 2d)$;

(4) When a $2d$ dimensional vector (x, y) is the variable of some function, say F, we will write $F(x, y)$ instead of $F((x, y))$ for simplicity;

(5) In this paper, we let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the L^1 norm on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ or $\mathbb{R}^d$.

3. THE MAIN RESULT

For the same δ appearing in $\varpi(x)$, we define $S^\delta = \{(x, y) \in D : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i < 2d^{1/(\alpha+1)}\delta\}$. Notice that $2d^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ is a constant independent of δ. Then we have the following theorem for any fixed $\delta > 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *When α is large enough, the random process $z(n)$'s two components $x(n)$ and $y(n)$ asymptotically have small joint support bounded by $c\delta$ almost surely, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\exists N, \bigcap_{n\geq N} \left\{z(n) \in S^\delta\right\}\right\} = 1.$$

Remark 3.2. *In this paper, for any fixed $d \geq 3 \in \mathbb{N}$, we say α is large enough, if the following two conditions hold:*

(1) Proposition A.1 holds for this α;

(2) $4 - 3d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} > 0$, i.e. $\alpha > \log d / \log \frac{4}{3}$.

The second condition is needed in the proof of Lemma 4.12.

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In Subsection 4.1, we will conclude that $z(n)$ belongs to a class of *stochastic approximation algorithms*. In Subsection 4.2, we will introduce the *interpolated process* which has the same limit set as $z(n)$. In Subsection 4.3, we will introduce the deterministic ODE associated with $z(n)$ and construct a non-rigorous Lyapunov function. In Subsection 4.4, we will state Benaïm's theorem which addresses the relation between the interpolated process and the ODE. In Subsection 4.5, we will give our main lemma, which describes the so-called *chain-recurrent set* for our specific semiflow induced by the ODE. In Subsection 4.19, we will use Pemantle's theorem to show that $z(n)$ has probability 0 to converge to some isolated unstable equilibrium. In Subsection 4.7, we finally give the proof of Theorem 3.1.

4.1. **Stochastic approximation algorithms.**

Definition 4.1. Stochastic approximation algorithms are discrete time stochastic processes whose general form can be written as

$$\xi(n + 1) - \xi(n) = \sigma_n H(\xi(n), \epsilon(n)) \tag{4.1}$$

where $H : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is a measurable function that characterizes the algorithm, $\{\xi(n)\}_{n\geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the sequence of parameters to be recursively updated, $\{\epsilon(n)\}_{n\geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a sequence of random inputs where $H(\xi(n), \epsilon(n))$ is observable, and $\{\sigma(n)\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a sequence of "small" nonnegative scalar gains.

Stochastic approximation algorithm basically is a discrete time random process defined by a recursive formula. The theory of stochastic approximations was born in the early 50s with the works of Robbins and Monro [19] and Kiefer and Wolfowitz [8].

Now to show that that $z(n)$ is stochastic approximation algorithm, we start with (2.6) and (2.7). Notice that the right hand sides of (2.6) and (2.7) is a map $M : D \to D$ and this map is continuous on the whole compact D, but not differentiable near the boundary of D (denoted by ∂D) according to the definition of $\varpi(x)$. Set a map $\pi = (\pi_i)_{i\in S} : \Delta \to \Delta$:

$$\pi_i(x) = \frac{\varpi(x_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} \varpi(x_k)}, \quad \forall x \in \Delta. \tag{4.2}$$

Then we can derive a *difference equation* for $x_i(n)$

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(n+1) - x_i(n) &= \frac{N(X,i,n) + 1_{X_{n+1}=i}}{n+1+N_0} - \frac{N(X,i,n)}{n+N_0} \\ &= \frac{-x_i(n) + 1_{X_{n+1}=i}}{n+1+N_0} \\ &= \frac{-x_i(n) + \pi_i(y(n))}{n+1+N_0} + \frac{1_{X_{n+1}=i} - \pi_i(y(n))}{n+1+N_0} \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Similarly, we can derive a difference equation for $y_i(n)$. Set

$$\epsilon_i^X(n) = \frac{1_{X_{n+1}=i} - \pi_i(y(n))}{n+1+N_0}, \quad \epsilon^X(n) = \left(\epsilon_i^X(n)\right)_{i\in S} \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$\epsilon_i^Y(n) = \frac{1_{Y_{n+1}=i} - \pi_i(x(n))}{n+1+N_0} \quad \epsilon^Y(n) = \left(\epsilon_i^Y(n)\right)_{i\in S}. \tag{4.5}$$

It follows from (2.6) and (2.7) that

$$\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i^X(n))|\mathcal{F}_n) = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i^Y(n))|\mathcal{F}_n) = 0, \quad \forall i \in S. \tag{4.6}$$

Then we can write the difference equation for the random process $(x(n), y(n))$ in the following vector form:

$$x(n+1) - x(n) = \frac{1}{n+1+N_0}(-x(n) + \pi(y(n))) + \epsilon^X(n) \tag{4.7}$$

$$y(n+1) - y(n) = \frac{1}{n+1+N_0}(-y(n) + \pi(x(n))) + \epsilon^Y(n). \tag{4.8}$$

Set $\epsilon(n) = \left(\epsilon^X(n), \epsilon^Y(n)\right)$ and $F(z(n)) = F(x(n), y(n)) = (-x(n)+\pi(y(n)), -y(n)+\pi(x(n)))$. One can also write (4.7) and (4.8) as

$$z(n+1) - z(n) = \frac{1}{n+1+N_0} F(z(n)) + \epsilon(n). \tag{4.9}$$

Then (4.9) implies that $z(n)$ is stochastic approximation algorithm. The stochastic approximations in the form of (4.9) with $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon(n)|\mathcal{F}_n) = 0$ is also called *Robbins-Monro stochastic approximation algorithm.* So our random process $z(n)$ is Robbins-Monro stochastic approximation algorithm.

As mentioned before, we will use the dynamical system approach to analyze (4.9). The dynamical system approach mainly says one can introduce the averaged ordinary differential equation (denoted by ODE)

$$\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = F(z(t)) \tag{4.10}$$

and then describe the asymptotic behavior of (4.9) by the semiflow (solution) induced by (4.10).

Remark 4.2. *In general, the derivation of (4.10) from the stochastic approximations is more complicated. See* [2].

An application of the dynamical system approach in VRRW is given in [3]. By the limit set theorem proved in [2], the main difficulty to apply this approach usually boils down to analyze the deterministic ODE, which is nontrivial in many occasions. Lyapunov function method is an ideal way. However, there is no general method to construct such a function.

4.2. **The interpolated process.**

In this section, we define stochastic approximation algorithm $z(n)$'s interpolated process. Set $\tau_0 = 0, \sigma_n = 1/(k+N_0), \tau_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k$.

Definition 4.3. $z(n)$'s interpolated process is defined as a continuous-time random process $z(t) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to D$ which satisfies:

(1) $z(t)|_{t=\tau_n} = z(n)$;
(2) $z(t)$ is affine on $[\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}]$.

The interpolated process in Definition 4.3 can be written in equations as follows:

$$z(t) = \sum_{n\geq 0} \left[(z(n+1) - z(n)) \frac{(t-\tau_n)}{1/(n+1+N_0)} + z(n) \right] \cdot 1_{[\tau_n, \tau_{n+1})}(t) \tag{4.11}$$

Set $z(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ where $x(t), y(t) \in \Delta$. For any fixed $t \in [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1})$, from (4.7) and (4.11), we can write the interpolated process of $x(n)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= (x(n+1) - x(n)) \frac{(t-\tau_n)}{1/(n+1+N_0)} + x(n) \\ &= (x(n+1) - x(n)) \frac{(t-\tau_n)}{1/(n+1+N_0)} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (x(k) - x(k-1)) + x(0) \\ &= \left[(-x(n) + \pi(y(n))) + (n+1+N_0)\epsilon^X(n) \right] (t - \tau_n) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left[(-x(k-1) + \pi(y(k-1))) + (k+N_0)\epsilon^X(k-1) \right] (\tau_{k-1} - \tau_k) + x(0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Notation 4.4. For any sequence $\{w(n)\}_{n\geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $w^0(\cdot)$ the step function

$$w^0(t) = \sum_{n\geq 0} w(n) 1_{[\tau_n, \tau_{n+1})}(t), \quad t \geq 0. \tag{4.13}$$

Set $\gamma(n) = (n+1+N_0)\epsilon^X(n)(n \geq 0)$. Then according to Notation 4.4, (4.12) can be written in integral forms

$$x(t) - x(0) = \int_0^t (-x^0(s) + \pi(y^0(s)))ds + \int_0^t \gamma^0(s)ds. \tag{4.14}$$

Let $\eta(n) = (n+1+N_0)\epsilon^Y(n)(n \geq 0)$. Similarly we have

$$y(t) - y(0) = \int_0^t (-y^0(s) + \pi(x^0(s)))ds + \int_0^t \eta^0(s)ds. \tag{4.15}$$

Set $z^0(t) = (x^0(t), y^0(t))$ and $\theta^0(t) = (\gamma^0(t), \eta^0(t))$. Then we can rewrite the integral equations (4.14) and (4.15) in a more unified form

$$z(t) - z(0) = \int_0^t F(z^0(s))ds + \int_0^t \theta^0(s)ds. \tag{4.16}$$

Let

$$L\left(\{z(n)\}_{n\geq 0}\right) = \bigcap_{k\geq 0} \overline{\{z(n) : n \geq k\}}, \tag{4.17}$$

and

$$L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right) = \bigcap_{s\geq 0} \overline{\{z(t) : t \geq s\}} \tag{4.18}$$

denote the omega limit set of $z(n)$ and $z(t)$ respectively. Then we have the following lemma due to Benaïm.

Lemma 4.5. [2, Lemma 4.1] $L\left(\{z(n)\}_{n\geq 0}\right) = L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right)$.

4.3. **The deterministic ODE.** Set $f(x) = \delta 1_{x\leq\delta} + x 1_{x>\delta}$, i.e. $f(x) = \varpi^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. According to the above analysis, the deterministic (approximating) ODE in our case is:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du_i(t)}{dt} = -u_i(t) + \frac{f(v_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^d f(v_k)^{-\alpha}} & i = 1, \dots, d \\ \frac{dv_i(t)}{dt} = -v_i(t) + \frac{f(u_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^d f(u_k)^{-\alpha}} & i = 1, \dots, d \end{cases} \tag{4.19}$$

or in vector form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du(t)}{dt} = -u(t) + \pi(v(t)) \\ \frac{dv(t)}{dt} = -v(t) + \pi(u(t)) \end{cases} \qquad \text{or} \qquad \frac{d\Xi(t)}{dt} = F(\Xi(t)) \tag{4.20}$$

where $\Xi(t) = (u(t), v(t)) \in D$.

We call the right hand side of (4.19) and (4.20) as the ODE's vector field. In our case, the vector field F is defined as a map $F : \Delta \times \Delta \to T(\Delta \times \Delta)$, i.e. $F : D \to TD$, where

$$TD = T(\Delta \times \Delta) = \left\{ (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \sum_{i\in S} u_i = 0, \sum_{i\in S} v_i = 0 \right\}.$$

Notice that the function $f(x)$ satisfies $f(x) \geq \delta$ and $1/f(x) \geq 1$. Hence by the fact that composition of Lipschitz functions is Lipschitz, F is globally Lipschitz. By theorem of maximal interval of existence of ODE's solution (see e.g. [13, Theorem 3.17]), it follows that the vector field F generates a unique *semiflow* in D

$$\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times D \to D,$$

$$(t, a) \to \Phi_t(a),$$

such that the solution to the initial value problem $d\Xi(t)/dt = F(\Xi(t))$ with initial condition $\Xi(0) = a \in D$ is the curve $t \to \Phi_t(a)$. Here to make things clear, we give the following definition.

Definition 4.6. A semiflow Φ on a metric space (D, μ) is a continuous map

$$\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times D \to D$$

$$(t, x) \to \Phi(t, x) = \Phi_t(x)$$

such that

$$\Phi_0 = Identity, \Phi_{t+s} = \Phi_t \circ \Phi_s$$

for all $(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Replacing $\mathbb{R}_+$ by $\mathbb{R}$ defines a flow.

Definition 4.7. A set I is said to be invariant (respectively, positive invariant) under a flow Ψ if for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ (respectively, for all $t \geq 0$), $\Psi_t(I) \subset I$.

In this paper, we always work with semiflow.

Proposition 4.8. *The domain D is positively invariant under Φ, the dynamics of F in (4.19).*

Proof. Suppose $(u, v) \in \partial D$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that there exists some $i \in S$ such that $u_i = 0$. Then by the definition of (4.19), we have

$$\left.\frac{du_i(t)}{dt}\right|_{(u,v)} \geq \inf_{v \in \Delta} \frac{f(v_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{j=1}^d f(v_j)^{-\alpha}} > 0,$$

Hence, $F(u, v)$ points inward whenever (u, v) belongs to the boundary of D. Thus any forward trajectory based in D remains in D. □

Notation 4.9. In this paper, we always use U to represent the d dimensional vector $(1/d, \ldots, 1/d)$. According to the previous notation, it is clear that (U, U) represents a $2d$ dimensional vector with each coordinate equal to $1/d$. Sometimes, we call U as uniform distribution.

It is easy to check that $p = (U, U)$ is a critical point of the vector field F, i.e. $F(p) = 0$. After the following definition, we will classify what type of critical point it is. Let T be the linear approximation to F near a critical point p so that $F(p + w) = T(w) + O(|w|^2)$, then

Definition 4.10. If all the eigenvalues of T have strictly negative real part, p is called an attracting point; if some eigenvalues of T have strictly positive real part, p is called an unstable critical point.

Proposition 4.11.
(1) *When $\alpha > 1$, (U, U) is a linearly unstable critical point for F.*
(2) *When $\alpha < 1$, (U, U) is an attracting point for F.*

Proof. Recall $d\Xi(t)/dt = F(\Xi(t))$ in (4.20). By Taylor expansion of F in a neighborhood of (U, U), we have

$$F(p + w) = DF|_p \cdot w + O(|w|^2),$$

where DF is Jacobian matrix and z is some vector in a neighborhood of 0 (2d dimensional vector). By direct calculation, one can have

$$DF\big|_p = \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccc}
-1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} \\
0 & -1 & 0 & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \dots & 0 & -1 & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} \\
\hline
-\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} & -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\
\frac{\alpha}{d} & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \dots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1
\end{array}\right).$$

In order to get all the eigenvalues of $DF\big|_p$, one need to solve

$$\left|DF\big|_p - \lambda I_{2d\times 2d}\right| = 0, \tag{4.21}$$

where $|\cdot|$ represents the matrix's determinant and $I_{2d\times 2d}$ is a $2d$ dimensional identity matrix. Notice that $DF\big|_p$ has the same right-upper and left-lower block matrix. We set this $d\times d$ matrix as

$$B = \begin{pmatrix}
-\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} \\
\frac{\alpha}{d} & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d} & \frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{\alpha}{d} & \dots & \frac{\alpha}{d} & -\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{d}
\end{pmatrix},$$

Because the sum of B's each row is zero, $|B| = 0$. Then one can easily check $\lambda = -1$ is a solution to (4.21). Now assume $\lambda \neq -1$. By Schur complement, from (4.21) we get

$$\left|B^2 - (\lambda+1)^2 I_{d\times d}\right| = 0, \tag{4.22}$$

where $I_{d\times d}$ is a d dimensional identity matrix. (4.22) is equivalent to

$$|B - (\lambda+1)I_{d\times d}| \cdot |B + (\lambda+1)I_{d\times d}| = 0. \tag{4.23}$$

Under the assumption $\lambda \neq -1$, we easily get all the solutions to (4.23): $\lambda = -1 \pm \alpha$. Hence all the eigenvalues of $DF\big|_p$ without counting multiplicities are

$$-1, -1 \pm \alpha.$$

So if $\alpha > 1$, $DF\big|_p$ has the positive eigenvalue $-1+\alpha$; If $\alpha < 1$, all of its eigenvalues are strictly negative. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Define the function $H(u,v) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i$, $((u,v) \in D)$. In fact, $H(u,v)$ plays the role of a Lyapunov function in our proof. However, from Lemma 4.12 below, one can see that it is not monotone in the whole domain, and hence it is not exactly a Lyapunov function according to the classical definition. Set the function H(t) associated with the semiflow Φ induced by (4.19) as

$$H(t) = H(u(t), v(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i(t) v_i(t). \tag{4.24}$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dH}{dt} &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i(t)\frac{du_i(t)}{dt} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i(t)\frac{dv_i(t)}{dt} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i\left(-u_i + \frac{f(v_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(v_k)^{-\alpha}}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i\left(-v_i + \frac{f(u_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(u_k)^{-\alpha}}\right) \\
&= -2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i f(u_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(u_k)^{-\alpha}} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i f(v_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(v_k)^{-\alpha}}. \qquad (4.25)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that (4.19) and (4.24) are autonomous, so is (4.25). Hence, the right side of (4.25) is often considered as a continuous function of (u, v) on D, which is independent of time t. We have the following lemma about (4.25).

Lemma 4.12. *When α is large enough, for any $(u, v) \in D$ satisfying $H(u, v) \geq \frac{3}{2}d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\delta$, the derivative of $H(t)$ satisfies*

$$\left.\frac{dH}{dt}\right|_{(u,v)} \leq 0. \qquad (4.26)$$

In the set $\left\{(u, v) \in D : H(u, v) \geq \frac{3}{2}d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\delta\right\}$, $dH/dt = 0$ holds if and only if $(u, v) = (U, U)$.

Proof. This proof is divided into three cases:

1. $\min_{i\in S} f(u_i) > \delta$ and $\min_{i\in S} f(v_i) > \delta$;
2. $\min_{i\in S} f(u_i) = \delta$ and $\min_{i\in S} f(v_i) > 2\delta$ (or the symmetric case);
3. $\min_{i\in S} f(u_i) = \delta$ and $\min_{i\in S} f(v_i) \leq 2\delta$ (or the symmetric case).

In Case (1), $\min_{i\in S} f(u_i) > \delta$ and $\min_{i\in S} f(v_i) > \delta$ imply $f(u_i) = u_i$ and $f(v_i) = v_i$ for any $i \in S$. By Proposition A.1 in the Appendix, we have showed that in this case $dH/dt|_{(u,v)} \leq 0$, and the equality holds if and only if $(u, v) = (U, U)$.

In Case (2), from the property of $f(x)$, i.e. $f(x) \geq x$ and (A.4) in the Appendix, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{dH}{dt}\right|_{(u,v)} &= -2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i f(u_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(u_k)^{-\alpha}} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i f(v_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(v_k)^{-\alpha}} \\
&\leq -2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} f(u_i) f(u_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(u_k)^{-\alpha}} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} f(v_i) f(v_i)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} f(v_k)^{-\alpha}} \\
&\leq -2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i + d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\left(\min_{i\in S} f(u_i) + \min_{i\in S} f(v_i)\right). \qquad (4.27)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i \geq \max\left\{\min_{i\in S} u_i, \min_{j\in S} v_j\right\},$$

in Case (2) it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i \geq \max\left\{\min_{i\in S} u_i, \min_{j\in S} v_j\right\} \geq \min_{j\in S} v_j = \min_{i\in S} f(v_i).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\frac{dH}{dt}\right|_{(u,v)} &\le -2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i + d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\left(\min_{i\in S} f(u_i) + \min_{i\in S} f(v_i)\right) \\ &\le -2\min_{i\in S} f(v_i) + d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\left(\delta + \min_{i\in S} f(v_i)\right) \\ &= -\left(2 - d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\right)\min_{i\in S} f(v_i) + d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\delta \\ &\le -\left(2 - d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\right)2\delta + d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\delta = -\left(4 - 3d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\right)\delta. \end{aligned}$$

So one can choose α large enough such that $4 - 3d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} > 0$, obtaining $dH/dt|_{(u,v)} < 0$.

In Case (3), from the given condition $H(u,v) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i > \frac{3}{2} d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\delta$ and (4.27), it follows that

$$\left.\frac{dH}{dt}\right|_{(u,v)} < -2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i + 3d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\delta < 0. \tag{4.28}$$

□

4.4. **Benaïm's theorems.** The exact relationship between the deterministic ODE and the asymptotic behavior of the interpolated process is addressed by the limit set theorem in [2]. We start a definition introduced in [5].

Definition 4.13. $z(t)$ is called an asymptotic pseudotrajectory of Φ if for $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sup_{0\le h\le T} d(z(t+h), \Phi_h(z(t))) = 0.$$

Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.14. *The interpolated process $z(t)$ in (4.16) is almost surely an asymptotic pseudotrajectory of the semiflow Φ induced by F in (4.20), i.e. for any $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sup_{0\le h\le T} \|(z(t+h) - \Phi_h(z(t)))\| = 0.$$

Proof. The main part of this proof is extracted from the proof of [2, Lemma 4.2].

With the same initial condition $z(t) \in D$, if comparing the interpolated process $z(s)$'s integral equation (4.16) with the semiflow Φ induced by the ODE (4.19) or (4.20) in the time interval $[t, t+h] (0 \le h \le T)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z(t+h) - \Phi_h(z(t)) &= z(t) + \int_0^h F(z^0(t+s))ds + \int_t^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds \\ &\quad - \left(z(t) + \int_0^h F\left(\Phi_s(z(t))\right)ds\right) \\ &= \int_0^h F(z^0(t+s))ds - \int_0^h F\left(\Phi_s(z(t))\right)ds + \int_t^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Set $\varphi(h) = \|z(t+h) - \Phi_h(z(t))\|$. By the Triangle inequality and (4.29),

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(h) &\leq L\int_0^h \varphi(s)ds + \int_0^h \left\|F(z(t+s)) - F(z^0(t+s))\right\| ds + \left\|\int_t^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\| \\ &\leq L\int_0^h \varphi(s)ds + L\int_0^h \left\|z(t+s) - z^0(t+s)\right\| ds + \left\|\int_t^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\|, \qquad (4.30)\end{aligned}$$

where L is the global Lipschitz constant of F on D. Set $m(t) = \sup\{p \in \mathcal{N} : \tau_p \leq t\}$, it follows from the definition of the interpolated process and (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|z(t+s) - z^0(t+s)\right\| &= \left\|\int_{\tau_{m(t+h)}}^{t+h} \left(F(z^0(s)) + \theta^0(s)\right) ds\right\| \\ &\leq \sigma_{m(t+h)}\|F\|_D + \left\|\int_{\tau_{m(t+h)}}^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\|, \qquad (4.31)\end{aligned}$$

where $\|F\|_D$ is uniform (supremum) norm of F on D. Now (4.30) and (4.31) together imply

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(h) \\ \leq\ & L\int_0^h \varphi(s)ds + LT\left(\sigma_{m(t+h)}\|F\|_D + \left\|\int_{\tau_{m(t+h)}}^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\|\right) + \left\|\int_t^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\| \\ =\ & L\int_0^h \varphi(s)ds + LT\sigma_{m(t+h)}\|F\|_D + LT\left\|\int_{\tau_{m(t+h)}}^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\| + \left\|\int_t^{t+h} \theta^0(s)ds\right\|. \\ & \qquad (4.32)\end{aligned}$$

Now define

$$\epsilon(n,T) = \sup_{\{k: 0 \leq \tau_k - \tau_n \leq T+1\}} \left\|\sum_{i=n}^{k-1} \epsilon(i)\right\|$$

where $\epsilon(i) = (\epsilon^X(i), \epsilon^Y(i))$ are the error terms defined in (4.4) and (4.5). It is easy to see

$$\forall p,q \in [\tau_{m(t)}, \tau_{m(t+T)+1}], \qquad \left\|\int_p^q \theta^0(s)ds\right\| \leq 2\epsilon(m(t),T).$$

Then it follows from (4.32) that

$$\varphi(h) \leq L\int_0^h \varphi(s)ds + LT\sigma_{m(t+h)}\|F\|_D + 2\epsilon(m(t),T)(LT+1).$$

By Gronwall's inequality, one gets

$$\sup_{h \in [0,T]} \varphi(h) \leq e^{LT}\left(LT\sigma_{m(t+h)}\|F\|_D + 2\epsilon(m(t),T)(LT+1)\right).$$

Because $\sigma_{m(t+h)} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, the proof of the lemma reduces to show

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon(n,T) = 0. \qquad (4.33)$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E}\left(\epsilon(i)|\mathcal{F}_i\right) = 0$ and $\|\epsilon(i)\|^2 \leq c/(i+N_0)^2$ for some positive constant

c. These imply $M_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon(i)$ is a martingale with bounded quadratic variation. Thus it converges to some finite random variable almost surely. Hence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\{k: 0\le \tau_k - \tau_n \le T+1\}} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{k-1} \epsilon(i) \right\| = 0. \tag{4.34}$$

This concludes the proof. □

Before stating Theorem 4.17, we need to give the definition of chain-recurrence. Suppose D is a metric space with a metric μ. In our case, μ is the metric induced by L^1 norm.

Definition 4.15. Let $\rho > 0$ and $T > 0$. A point z is said to be (ρ, T) recurrent if there exist an integer k, some points z_i in D, and numbers $t_i, 0 \le i \le k-1$, such that

$$t_i \ge T; \quad \mu(z_0, z) < \rho; \quad \mu(\Phi_{t_i}(z_i), z_{i+1}) < \rho, \quad i = 0, \dots, k-1; \quad x = z_k.$$

z is said to be chain-recurrent, if z is (ρ, T) recurrent for any $\rho > 0$ and $T > 0$.

We denote by $CR(\Phi)$ the set of chain-recurrent points. The set $CR(\Phi)$ has the property to be closed and invariant.

Definition 4.16. A subset $R \subset D$ is called internally chain-recurrent if R is a nonempty compact invariant (respectively, positive invariant) set of which every point is chain-recurrent for the restricted flow (respectively, semiflow) $\Phi|R$.

The following theorem, which is due to Benaïm, demonstrates the relation between the asymptotic behavior of asymptotic pseudotrajectories and the dynamics of Φ. The theorem can be viewed as a deterministic statement.

Theorem 4.17. [2, Theorem 1.2, Corollary 4.3] *Let $z(t)$ be an asymptotic pseudotrajectories of Φ. Then $L(\{z(t)\}_{t\ge 0})$, defined in (4.18), is a connected set internally chain-recurrent for the semiflow Φ.*

4.5. **The main lemma.** Now it comes to our main lemma to prove Theorem 3.1. This lemma describes the chain recurrent set for our specific dynamic Φ. In the proof of this lemma, Lemma 4.12 will be heavily used. Recall $S^\delta = \{(x, y) \in D : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i < 2d^{1/(\alpha+1)}\delta\}$.

Lemma 4.18. *$CR(\Phi) \subset S^\delta \cup (U, U)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.12, S^δ is a compact positively invariant set with respect to the semiflow Φ, and $H(\Phi_t)$ is strictly decreasing when Φ_t locates outside $S^\delta \cup (U, U)$.

Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be small enough, s.t. $\zeta_0 := 2d^{1/(\alpha+1)}\delta - \epsilon_0 > (3/2) \cdot d^{1/(\alpha+1)} \cdot \delta$. Set $\zeta_1 = 2d^{1/(\alpha+1)}\delta$ and $\zeta_2 = 1$. Then define $M_i = \{(x, y) \in D : H(x, y) \le \zeta_i\} (i = 0, 1, 2)$. Note that $M_1 = S^\delta, M_2 = D$. Then we are going to prove this lemma by the following steps:

(1) Any chain $\{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ satisfying $\mu(\Phi_{t_i}(z_i), z_{i+1}) < \rho$ for some $t_i \ge T$ with $z_0 \in M_j$ is included in $M_j (j = 0, 1, 2)$;
(2) $CR_1 = CR(\Phi) \cap M_1$ and $CR_2 = CR(\Phi) \cap (M_2 \backslash M_1)$ are positively invariants sets;
(3) $CR_2 = (U, U)$.

Proof of of Step 1. Let $T > 0$. By compactness of the sets $M_j (j = 0, 1, 2)$, it follows from Lemma 4.12 that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall z \in M_j, H(\Phi_T(z)) \le \zeta_j - \epsilon.$$

Pick $\rho > 0$ such that

$$\forall (z, w) \in D \times D, \mu(z, w) \le \rho \Rightarrow |H(z) - H(w)| \le \epsilon.$$

Then it follows that any chain $\{z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_k\}$ satisfying $\mu(\Phi_{t_i}(z_i), z_{i+1}) < \rho$ for some $t_i \ge T$ with $z_0 \in M_j$ is included in $M_j (j = 0, 1, 2)$. □

Proof of of Step 2. By the invariance of $CR(\Phi)$ and M_1, it is clear that CR_1 is positively invariant.

For some $z \in CR_2$, suppose there exists some $T_0 > 0$, such that $\Phi_{T_0}(z) \in M_1$. Then by Lemma 4.12, there exists some $T' > 0$, such that for $T := T_0 + T'$,

$$H(\Phi_T(z)) < \zeta_0. \tag{4.35}$$

By continuity of Φ, there exists some $\rho > 0$ small enough, such that

$$\Phi_T(z_0) \in M_0, \quad \forall z_0 \in B(z, \rho).$$

By invariance of M_0, it follows that for all $t \ge T$

$$\Phi_t(z_0) \in M_0, \quad \forall z_0 \in B(z, \rho).$$

Without loss of generality, ρ can be assumed to be smaller than the distance between M_0 and $\overline{D \setminus M_1}$ (closure of $D \setminus M_1$). Then the following is true for all $t \ge T$

$$\mu(\Phi_t(z_0), z_1) < \rho \Rightarrow z_1 \in M_1.$$

Step 1 tells us that any (ρ, T) chain $(z_1, \ldots, z_k)$ with $z_1 \in M_1$ is included in M_1. Hence if $\rho < \mu(z, M_1)$ is further assumed, for any finite sequence $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_k)$ with $t_i \ge T$ satisfying

$$\mu(z_0, z) < \rho, \quad \mu(\Phi_{t_i}(z_i), z_{i+1}) < \rho, \quad i = 0, \ldots, k-1,$$

the following always holds

$$\mu(\Phi_{t_k}(z_k), z) > \rho.$$

This implies z cann't be (ρ, T) chain recurrent, which contradicts the assumption. Hence, $\Phi_t(CR_2) \subset M_2 \setminus M_1$ for all $t \ge 0$. By invariance of $CR(\Phi)$, CR_2 is positively invariant. □

Proof of of Step 3. It suffices to show $CR_2 \subset (U, U)$. For any $z \in CR_2$, by invariance of CR_2 and the non-increasing property of the Lyapunov function $H(\cdot)$ along any trajectories in $M_2 \setminus M_1$, it follows that the limit of $H(\Phi_t(z))$ exists. Set

$$H(\Phi_\infty(z)) = \lim_{t \to +\infty} H(\Phi_t(z)).$$

Hence, for any $p \in \omega(z)$, $H(p) = H(\Phi_\infty(z))$. Together with invariance of $\omega(z)$ (as a set), this implies $H(\cdot)$ is constant along trajectories in $\omega(z)$. Therefore, $\omega(z) \subset (U, U)$, i.e. $\omega(z) = (U, U)$.

Now we will show $z = (U, U)$. Suppose $z \ne (U, U)$, then $H(\Phi_t(z))$ is strictly decreasing in a neighborhood of z. Since $H(\Phi_t(z)) \ge H(\omega(z)) = H(U, U) = 1/d$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, s.t.

$$H(z) > \frac{1}{d} + \epsilon.$$

Define

$$E = \left\{ w \in D | H(w) < \frac{1}{d} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \right\}, \quad F = \left\{ w \in D | H(w) \geq \frac{1}{d} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right\}.$$

By compactness of $D \setminus E$ and the strictly decreasing property of $H(\cdot)$, there exists some T, such that for any $t \geq T$

$$\Phi_t(w) \in E, \quad \forall w \in D \setminus E. \tag{4.36}$$

In particular, (4.36) holds for some small ball $B(z, \rho) \subset F$ and all $t \geq T$, i.e.

$$\Phi_t(w) \in E, \quad \forall w \in B(z, \rho). \tag{4.37}$$

By the similar argument as that in the proof of Step 2, one can get that (4.37) contradicts the fact that z is a chain recurrent point. $\square$

Now we can finish the proof of this lemma. From Step 2 and 3, we have $CR_1 \subset M_1$ and $CR_2 \subset (U, U)$, and hence $CR(\Phi) \subset M_1 \cup (U, U) = S^\delta \cup (U, U)$. $\square$

4.6. **Non-convergence to unstable equilibrium.** As for $z(n)$'s non-convergenc to $p = (U, U)$, we are exactly in the setting of the following theorem due to Pemantle [15].

Theorem 4.19. [15, Theorem 1] *Define a stochastic process*

$$z(n+1) - z(n) = \sigma_n F(z(n)) + \epsilon(n)$$

with σ_n being $\mathcal{F}_n-$measurable and $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon(n)|\mathcal{F}_n) = 0$ and such that $z(n)$ always remains in bounded domain D. Let p be any point of D with $F(p) = 0$, let $\mathcal{N}$ be a neighborhood of p and assume that there are constants $\gamma \in (1/2, 1]$ and $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ for which the following conditions are satisfied whenever $z(n) \in \mathcal{N}$ and n is sufficiently large:

1. *p is a linearly unstable critical point,*
2. *$c_1/n^\gamma \leq \sigma_n \leq c_2/n^\gamma$,*
3. *$\mathbb{E}((\epsilon(n) \cdot \theta)^+ | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq c_3/n^\gamma$ for every unit vector $\theta \in TD$, where TD is the tangent space to D,*
4. *$\|\epsilon(n)\| \leq c_4/n^\gamma$,*

where $(\epsilon(n) \cdot \theta)^+ = \max\{\epsilon(n) \cdot \theta, 0\}$ is the positive part of $\epsilon(n) \cdot \theta$. Assume F is smooth enough to apply the stable manifold theorem: at least C^2. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lim_{n \to \infty} z(n) = p\right) = 0.$$

Before applying Theorem 4.19 to our case, we need the following lemma, which is to check the noise terms $\epsilon(n)$ in our case satisfies Condition (3) in Theorem 4.19.

Lemma 4.20. *In a small neighborhood of $p = (U, U)$, there exists some constant $c > 0$, s.t. $\mathbb{E}((\epsilon(n) \cdot \theta)^+ | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq c/n$ for every unit vector $\theta = (\theta_k)_{1 \leq k \leq 2d} \in TD$.*

Proof. Suppose $X_{n+1} = i \in S, Y_{n+1} = j \in S$. Then according to (4.4) and (4.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(n+1+N_0)\epsilon(n)\cdot\theta &= (1-\pi_i(y(n)))\theta_i - \sum_{m\neq i, m\in S}\pi_m(y(n))\theta_m \\ &\quad +(1-\pi_j(x(n)))\theta_{j+d} - \sum_{p\neq j, p\in S}\pi_p(x(n))\theta_{p+d} \\ &= \theta_i + \theta_{j+d} - \sum_{m\in S}\pi_m(y(n))\theta_m - \sum_{p\in S}\pi_p(x(n))\theta_{p+d} \quad (4.38)\end{aligned}$$

For any unit vector $\theta \in TD$, the following holds

$$\max_{1\le k\le 2d}\theta_k \ge \frac{1}{(d-1)\sqrt{2d}}. \tag{4.39}$$

Indeed, since θ is a unit vector (say $\|\theta\|_{L^2}$=1),

$$\max_{1\le k\le 2d}|\theta_k| \ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{2d}}.$$

Now if the following inequality

$$\max_{1\le k\le 2d}\theta_k \ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{2d}}\left(> \frac{1}{(d-1)\sqrt{2d}}\right)$$

doesn't hold, there must be

$$\min_{1\le k\le 2d}\theta_k \le -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2d}}.$$

Since $\sum_{k=1}^{d}\theta_k = 0$ and $\sum_{k=d+1}^{2d}\theta_k = 0$, there exists some coordinate $1 \le k_0 \le 2d$, s.t.

$$\theta_{k_0} \ge \frac{1}{(d-1)\sqrt{2d}},$$

which implies (4.39).

From (4.39), without loss of generality, we can assume $\theta_1 = \max_{1\le k\le 2d}\theta_k \ge \frac{1}{(d-1)\sqrt{2d}}$. By $\sum_{k=d+1}^{2d}\theta_k = 0$, there always exists some $j_0 \in S$, s.t. $\theta_{j_0+d} \ge 0$.

Because $(x(n), y(n)$ lives in a small neighborhood of (U,U), $\pi(x(n))$ and $\pi(y(n))$ also live in a small neighborhood of (U,U), and hence in (4.38),

$$\sum_{m\in S}\pi_m(y(n))\theta_m \sim 0, \sum_{p\in S}\pi_p(x(n))\theta_{p+d} \sim 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}(n+1+N_0)\mathbb{E}((\epsilon(n)\cdot\theta)^+|\mathcal{F}_n) &\ge \mathbb{P}(X_{n+1}=1, Y_{n+1}=j_0)\theta_1 \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_{n+1}=1)\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1}=j_0)\theta_1 \\ &\ge c,\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is by the fact that $(x(n), y(n)$ lives in a small neighborhood of (U,U) and hence $\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1}=1)$ and $\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1}=j_0)$ are bounded from below. $\square$

Now we can apply Theorem 4.19 to our case.

Lemma 4.21. *When $\alpha > 1$, for any initial condition $(x(0), y(0)) \in D$, $z(n)$ in our model satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} z(n) = (U, U)\right) = 0.$$

Proof. In our case, $x(n)$ and $y(n)$ are occupation measures, and hence $z(n)$ always remains in the domain D for all time $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We also have $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon(n)|\mathcal{F}_n) = 0$. Hence $z(n)$ is exactly in the class of stochastic process defined in Theorem 4.19 for $\sigma_n = 1/(n + 1 + N_0), \gamma = 1$.

Now we need to check all the conditions in the theorem hold in our model. According to Proposition 4.11, p is a linearly unstable fixed point, and hence Condition (1) holds. It is also easy to see that Condition (2) and (4) hold in our case. Lemma 4.20 implies Condition (3). F is also smooth (at least C^2) in a large fixed neighborhood of p. Since all the conditions in Theorem 4.19 hold in our model, we can apply the theorem and conclude the proof of the lemma. □

4.7. **Proof of Theorem 3.1.**

Proof. It suffices to show the interpolated process $z(t)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\exists T, \bigcap_{t\geq T}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i(t)y_i(t) \leq c\delta\right\}\right\} = 1,$$

since the two random processes have exactly the same limit set according to Lemma 4.5.

Now from Lemma 4.14 and Theorem 4.17, it follows that the interpolated process $z(t)$'s limit set satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right) \subset CR(\Phi)\right) = 1.$$

Then Lemma 4.18 implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right) \subset S^{\delta} \cup (U, U)\right) = 1.$$

By Theorem 4.17, $L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right)$ is nonempty connected compact set. Since (U, U) is an isolated equilibrium, together with Lemma 4.21 it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right) \subset S^{\delta}\right) = 1,$$

which concludes the proof. □

Remark 4.22. *Note that in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we just used the fact that $L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right) \subset CR(\Phi)$, which is a weaker result than that stated in Theorem 4.17, i.e. $L\left(\{z(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right)$ is internally chain recurrent.*

5. FURTHER QUESTIONS

Conjecture 5.1. $\alpha_c = 1$ is critical, i.e. for any given initial condition $(x(0), y(0)) \in D$,

(1) when $\alpha > 1$, there exists some constant $c = c(\alpha, d)$ depending on α and d, such that the following holds for any small positive δ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\exists N, \bigcap_{n\geq N}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i(n)y_i(n) \leq c\delta\right\}\right\} = 1.$$

(2) when $0 < \alpha < 1$, the following holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\lim_{n\to\infty} z(n) = (U, U)\right\} = 1.$$

Question 5.2. *When $\delta = 0$, derive the similar result as Theorem 3.1.*

For our model defined in (2.1) and (2.2), little is known so far. On $\mathbb{Z}^2$, we even are not able to prove that each vertex will eventually be visited by at least one of X, Y almost surely. Another question of interest is

Question 5.3. *When the weight sequence is $w_k = k^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$, what is the nearest neighbor interacting random walk X, Y's behavior on the lattices $\mathbb{Z}^d$? How does this behavior change as α and d vary?*

Question 5.4. *Similar as (2.1) and (2.2), one can define two particle edge-reinforced interacting random walk. Then what is its behavior?*

Question 5.5. *Similarly defined as (2.1) and (2.2), if there are more than two particles performing reinforced interacting random walk on some finite or infinite connected graph, what is the model's asymptotic behavior?*

6. Acknowledgements

The author thanks Itai Benjamini for his stimulating questions. The author is greatly indebted to Prof. Ofer Zeitouni for his patient guidance and numerous insights on this work. The author is also thankful to Dr. Yuri Lima for all the discussions with him on dynamical systems.

References

[1] O. Angel, N. Crawford, and G. Kozma, *Localization for linearly edge reinforced random walks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.4010 (2012).

[2] M. Benaim, *A dynamical system approach to stochastic approximations*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **34** (1996), no. 2, 437–472.

[3] M. Benaïm, *Vertex-reinforced random walks and a conjecture of pemantle*, The Annals of Probability **25** (1997), no. 1, 361–392.

[4] ______, *Dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms*, Seminaire de probabilites XXXIII (1999), 1–68.

[5] M. Benaïm and M.W. Hirsch, *Asymptotic pseudotrajectories and chain recurrent flows, with applications*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations **8** (1996), no. 1, 141–176.

[6] B. Davis, *Reinforced random walk*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **84** (1990), no. 2, 203–229.

[7] B.M. Hill, D. Lane, and W. Sudderth, *A strong law for some generalized urn processes*, The Annals of Probability **8** (1980), no. 2, 214–226.

[8] J. Kiefer and J. Wolfowitz, *Stochastic estimation of the maximum of a regression function*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics **23** (1952), no. 3, 462–466.

[9] Y. Kovchegov, *Multi-particle processes with reinforcements*, Journal of Theoretical Probability **21** (2008), no. 2, 437–448.

[10] V. Limic, *Attracting edge property for a class of reinforced random walks*, The Annals of Probability **31** (2003), no. 3, 1615–1654.

[11] V. Limic and P. Tarrès, *Attracting edge and strongly edge reinforced walks*, The Annals of Probability **35** (2007), no. 5, 1783–1806.

[12] L. Ljung, *Analysis of recursive stochastic algorithms*, Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on **22** (1977), no. 4, 551–575.

[13] J.D. Meiss, *Differential dynamical systems (monographs on mathematical modeling and computation)*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007.

[14] R. Pemantle, *Phase transition in reinforced random walk and rwre on trees*, The Annals of Probability **16** (1988), no. 3, 1229–1241.

[15] ———, *Nonconvergence to unstable points in urn models and stochastic approximations*, The Annals of Probability **18** (1990), no. 2, 698–712.

[16] ———, *A survey of random processes with reinforcement*, Probability surveys **4** (2007), no. 1-79, 25.

[17] R. Pemantle et al., *Random processes with reinforcement* (1988).

[18] R. Pemantle and S. Volkov, *Vertex-reinforced random walk on z has finite range*, The Annals of Probability **27** (1999), no. 3, 1368–1388.

[19] H. Robbins and S. Monro, *A stochastic approximation method*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics (1951), 400–407.

[20] T. Sellke, *Reinforced random walk on the d-dimensional integer lattice*, preprint (1994).

[21] P. Tarrès, *Vertex-reinforced random walk on z eventually gets stuck on five points*, The Annals of Probability **32** (2004), no. 3B, 2650–2701.

[22] S. Volkov, *Phase transition in vertex-reinforced random walks on with non-linear reinforcement*, Journal of Theoretical Probability **19** (2006), no. 3, 691–700.

Appendix A. Proof of one inequality

Proposition A.1. *For any fixed positive integer $d(\geq 2)$, there exists some $\alpha(d)$, such that when $\alpha > \alpha(d)$, the following inequality holds:*

$$2\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{u_i^{\alpha}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{v_i^{\alpha}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{v_i^{1+\alpha}}} \tag{A.1}$$

for all $(u, v) = ((u_i)_{i\in S}, (v_i)_{i\in S}) \in D^{\circ}$. In particular, the equality holds if and only if $u_i = v_i = \frac{1}{d}$ for any i, i.e. $(u, v) = (U, U)$.

To prove this proposition, we need several lemmas.

Lemma A.2. *For any fixed $\alpha > 0$ and positive integer d, the following holds for all $a_i \in (0, 1] (i = 1, \ldots, d-1)$,*

$$f(a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}) := \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{\alpha}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{1+\alpha}} < d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}.$$

Proof. By General Mean inequality, for any $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$\left(\frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{\alpha}}{d}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{\alpha+1}}{d}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}},$$

i.e.

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{\alpha} \leq d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{\alpha+1}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$f(a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}) \leq \frac{d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{\alpha+1}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{1+\alpha}} = \frac{d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}}{\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{1+\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}} < d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}.$$

□

Lemma A.3. *When $\alpha > d - 2$, U (uniform distribution) is a local minimum for the following function*

$$g(u_1, \ldots, u_d) := 2\min_{i\in S} u_i - d\left(\min_{i\in S} u_i\right)^2 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{u_i^{\alpha}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}}.$$

In particular, $g\left(\frac{1}{d},\ldots,\frac{1}{d}\right)=0$.

Proof. Set $w_i = u_i S > 0$. By change of variables in function $g(u_1,\ldots,u_d)$, we have

$$G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)=\frac{2}{S}\min_{i\in S} w_i-\frac{d}{S^2}(\min_{i\in S} w_i)^2-\frac{1}{S}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{w_i^\alpha}}{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{w_i^{1+\alpha}}}$$

where $S=\sum_{i=1}^d w_i$. Notice that $G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)$ is a homogeneous function on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^+$, and $u_i = w_i/S = w_i/\sum_{j=1}^d w_j$ is a natural bijection between the lines in $(\mathbb{R}^d)^+$ and the points in Δ°, which gives the exactly same value through the functions $G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)$ and $g(u_1,\ldots,u_d)$. So we can work with the function $G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)$ without constraints instead of $g(u_1,\ldots,u_d)$ with constraints, to prove that the diagonal $(w_1,\ldots,w_d)=(w,\ldots,w)$ (w is any positive real number) is a local minimum of $G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)$.

Without loss of generality, we assume $w_d=\min_{i\in S} w_i$, then

$$G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)=\frac{2}{S}w_d-\frac{d}{S^2}(w_d)^2-\frac{1}{S}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{w_i^\alpha}}{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{w_i^{1+\alpha}}}. \tag{A.2}$$

By direct calculation, we can check that $G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)$ has zero gradient on the diagonal, i.e.

$$\nabla G|_{w_i=w}=0.$$

Then the Hessian matrix of $G(w_1,\ldots,w_d)$ evaluated at the diagonal $w_i=w$ is

$$H|_{w_i=w}=\frac{2}{d^2w^2}$$
$$\cdot\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1 & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1 & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots\\ -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1 & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & \cdots & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1+2-d \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set

$$M=\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1 & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1 & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots\\ -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1 & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & \cdots & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+\alpha+1+2-d \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$N=\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots\\ -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d}\\ 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & \cdots & \cdots & 1-\frac{\alpha+2}{d} & -\frac{\alpha+2}{d}+2-d \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then H, M and N satisfy

$$H|_{w_i=w}=\frac{2}{d^2w^2}M,\quad M=(\alpha+1)I+N,$$

where I is identity matrix. And by direct calculation, we can get all the eigenvalues of matrix N

$$\lambda_1^N = \ldots = \lambda_{d-2}^N = 0, \lambda_{d-1}^N = -(\alpha+1), \lambda_d^N = -\left(\frac{d\alpha}{\alpha+2}+1\right),$$

and hence get all the eigenvalues of M (shifted by $\alpha+1$ from N's eigenvalues)

$$\lambda_1^M = \ldots = \lambda_{d-2}^M = \alpha+1, \lambda_{d-1}^M = 0, \lambda_d^M = \frac{\alpha(\alpha+2-d)}{\alpha+2}.$$

It is easy to see that when $\alpha > d-2$, one of M's eigenvalues is zero and all the others are positive. It is also easy to check that the sum of each row of M is zero, which means

$$M\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \vdots\\ 1\end{pmatrix} = 0\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \vdots\\ 1\end{pmatrix}.$$

That is, the diagonal is an eigenvector associated with M's zero eigenvalue and then H's zero eigenvalue. This tells us that our original function $G(w_1, \ldots, w_d)$ is convex along all the other directions except the diagonal, which implies that the diagonal is its local minimum. Hence the uniform distribution is a local minimum of $g(u_1, \ldots, u_d)$. □

Lemma A.4. *For any fixed positive integer d, there exists some $\alpha(d)$, such that when $\alpha > \alpha(d)$, the following inequality holds:*

$$2\min_{i\in S} u_i - d\left(\min_{i\in S} u_i\right)^2 \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^\alpha}}{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}} \tag{A.3}$$

for any $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_d) \in \Delta^\circ$. In particular, the equality holds if and only if u is uniform distribution, i.e. $u = U$.

Proof. We will prove (A.3) in two cases:

1. u is far from the uniform distribution, i.e. $\min_{i\in S} u_i < \kappa/d$ for some positive $\kappa < 1$ (close to 1);
2. near the uniform distribution.

In Case (1), we try to use the minimum coordinates of u to bound the right hand side of (A.3) from above. More precisely, for fixed d, α, we try to find some small $c(\alpha, d)$ such that the following inequality holds for any $u \in \Delta^\circ$,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^\alpha}}{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}} \leq c(\alpha, d)\min_{i\in S} u_i. \tag{A.4}$$

Notice that without loss of generality, we can assume $u_d = \min_{i\in S} u_i$, and then if we set $a_i = \min_{i\in S} u_i/u_i = u_d/u_i \in (0,1]$ in (A.4), the problem to get a small constant $c(\alpha, d)$ in (A.4) is equivalent to get a good upper bound for the following quantity

$$f(a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}) = \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^\alpha}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i^{1+\alpha}} \tag{A.5}$$

with $a_i \in (0,1] (i = 1, \ldots, d-1)$.

By Lemma A.2, we will take $c(\alpha, d) = d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}$. Then it is easy to check that when $\alpha \geq \log d / \log(2-\kappa) - 1$, the following inequality holds

$$d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} \cdot u_d < 2u_d - du_d^2, \quad \textit{i.e.} \quad d^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} < 2 - du_d \tag{A.6}$$

for any $0 < u_d < \kappa/d$. Then the inequalities (A.4) and (A.6) together imply that when $\alpha \geq \log d / \log(2-\kappa) - 1$,

$$2 \min_{i \in S} u_i - d \left(\min_{i \in S} u_i \right)^2 > \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^\alpha}}{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}} \tag{A.7}$$

for any u satisfying $\min_{i \in S} u_i < \kappa/d$.

In Case (2), Lemma A.3 implies (A.3).

Finally, we need to glue the results in the above two cases together. For fixed positive integer d, when $\alpha > d-2$, there exists a neighborhood of uniform distribution $\mathcal{N}(U, \epsilon_\alpha)$ s.t.

$$g(u_1, \ldots, u_d) \geq 0 \tag{A.8}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{N}(U, \epsilon_\alpha)$. The equality holds if and only if $u = U$. For any $u \neq U$ in Δ°, since $\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^\alpha} / \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}$ is a decreasing function in α (can be proved by directly checking the derivative), so $g(u_1, \ldots, u_d)$ is an increasing function in α, which allows us to take some common $\mathcal{N}(U, \epsilon_d) = \bigcap_{\alpha > d-2} \mathcal{N}(U, \epsilon_\alpha)$ just depending on d such that the inequality (A.8) holds. Now we take some $\kappa = \kappa(d) < 1$ such that

$$\left\{ u \in \Delta^\circ : \min_{i \in S} u_i < \frac{\kappa}{d} \right\} \cup \mathcal{N}(U, \epsilon_d) = \Delta^\circ,$$

and then combine the inequalities (A.7) and (A.8), obtaining that when

$$\alpha > \max \left\{ d-2, \frac{\log d}{\log(2 - \kappa(d))} - 1 \right\},$$

(A.3) holds. The equality condition can also be easily checked. □

Proof of Proposition A.1. First for any $u, v \in \Delta^\circ$, we will bound the left hand side of inequality (A.1) from below by the minimum coordinates of u and v. More precisely, if we set

$$u' = \left(\min_{i \in S} u_i, \ldots, \min_{i \in S} u_i, 1 - (d-1) \min_{i \in S} u_i \right)$$

and

$$v' = \left(1 - (d-1) \min_{i \in S} v_i, \min_{i \in S} v_i, \ldots, \min_{i \in S} v_i \right),$$

we will show

$$\sum_{i=1}^d u_i v_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^d u_i' v_i', \tag{A.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i' v_i' &= (d-2)\min_{i\in S} u_i \min_{i\in S} v_i + \left(1-(d-1)\min_{i\in S} u_i\right)\min_{i\in S} v_i \\ &\quad + \left(1-(d-1)\min_{i\in S} v_i\right)\min_{i\in S} u_i \\ &= \min_{i\in S} u_i + \min_{i\in S} v_i - d\cdot \min_{i\in S} u_i \min_{i\in S} v_i\end{aligned}$$

is a function just depending on the minimum coordinates of u and v. By the Rearrangement inequality, it suffices to show (A.9) is true for any increasing $\{u_i\}_{i\in S}$ and decreasing $\{v_i\}_{i\in S}$ in Δ°. For such $\{u_i\}_{i\in S}$ and $\{v_i\}_{i\in S}$, one can have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i &= u_1 v_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{d} u_i v_d + \sum_{i=2}^{d} u_i (v_i - v_d) \\ &\geq u_1 v_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{d} u_i v_d + \sum_{i=2}^{d} u_1 (v_i - v_d) \\ &= u_1(1-(d-1)v_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{d} u_i v_d \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i v_i' \geq \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i' v_i',\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is obtained by repeating the same argument as in the previous steps. Hence, we have proved (A.9).

By Lemma A.4, we know that there exists some $\alpha(d)$, such that when $\alpha > \alpha(d)$, the following inequalities hold for any $u, v \in \Delta^\circ$

$$2\min_{i\in S} u_i - d\left(\min_{i\in S} u_i\right)^2 \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{u_i^{\alpha}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{u_i^{1+\alpha}}}$$

and

$$2\min_{i\in S} v_i - d\left(\min_{i\in S} v_i\right)^2 \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{v_i^{\alpha}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{v_i^{1+\alpha}}}.$$

Then by the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}&2\left(\min_{i\in S} u_i + \min_{i\in S} v_i - d\min_{i\in S} u_i \min_{i\in S} v_i\right) \\ \geq\ &\left(2\min_{i\in S} u_i - d\left(\min_{i\in S} u_i\right)^2\right) + \left(2\min_{i\in S} v_i - d\left(\min_{i\in S} v_i\right)^2\right),\end{aligned}$$

we have proved (A.1).

It is also easy to check the equality holds if and only if both u and v are uniform distributions, i.e. $u = v = U$. □

Weizmann Institute of Science, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, POB 26, 76100, Rehovot, Israel.
E-mail address: `jun.chen@weizmann.ac.il`